UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/178,887	10/27/1998	YOSHINORI SUGAHARA	018656-048	5088

7590 04/07/2004

Platon N. Mandros
BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P.
P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404

EXAMINER	
TRAN, DOUGLAS Q	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2624	

DATE MAILED: 04/07/2004

38

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/178,887	Applicant(s) SUGAHARA, YOSHINORI
	Examiner Douglas Q. Tran	Art Unit 2624

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *21 January 2004*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,4,6,10,11,13-19,21-23,27-35 and 40-55* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,4,6,10,11,13-19,21-23,27-35 and 40-55* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Request for Continued Examination

1. The request filed on 1/21/04 for a Request For Continued Examination (RCE) Pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114.based on the Application Serial No. 09/178,887. An action on the RCE follows.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1, 11, 13, 22, 27-35 and 40-55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Onaga (US Patent No. 5,862,404) in combination with Mandel (US Patent No. 5,435,544).

As to claim 1, Onaga teaches a print system, comprising:

a plurality of printers (i.e., 110a to 110e in fig. 1) and a plurality of computers (150a to 150a to 150d in fig. 1) connected to the print server (i.e., 120 in fig. 1);

the print server includes a job observation module (i.e., a software within the server) for monitoring an gathering the status of the plurality of printers connected to the print server, and sends the gathered status to the plurality of computers simultaneously (note: the file server which maintains 3 types of files 'col. 4, lines 41-42' included in a single file having information

regarding all the output devices 110 in LAN 'col. 4, lines 55-58', and which provides to all of workstations 150 'col. 6, lines 26-32');

(it is noted that col. 4, lines 60-65 describes that the status information from the peripheral devices is stored in a central location from which all workstations obtain it. Another important factor is that discovery need be performed only once for all intelligent peripheral devices and all workstations; and col. 6, lines 31-33 also describes that after the file server provides the devices status information to the workstations, **each** workstation 150 can read the device status file and display the device status information "col. 6, lines 29-30 and 32-33". And the device status files are preferably updated with sufficient frequency to provide the workstations. That means the file server provides all of the status of the peripheral devices **simultaneously** to the workstations. Even if a plurality of workstations requests to the file server the status of the peripheral devices at the same time, then the file server provides the status of the peripheral devices **simultaneously** to the plurality of requested workstations;

each of computers includes a status monitor for displaying the status (col. 6, lines 33-36).

Although Onaga teaches that the device list files, device status file, and jobs files, is provided automatically to each workstation during the setup process (col. 5, lines 48-50), Onaga does not explicitly teach each of computers receives the status of the printers without sending a status request.

Mandel, in the same field of endeavor , teaches the print server in the network (please the fig. 22) can also automatically generate a network message to the users (or computers) a status of printers and jobs without receiving the request from the computers (col. 1, lines 40-46).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the server of Onaga for automatically notifying the status of a printer to the computers without receiving the request from the computers as taught by Mandel. The suggestion for modifying the system of Onaga can be reasoned by one of ordinary skill in the art as set forth by Mandel because the modified printer server would increase the advantage of the printing system by keeping track the status of the printer and automatically distributing the status of the printers to each of the computers. Such a modification would allow the users easily to find the status of the jobs and the printers.

As to claim 11, Onaga and Mandel teach the method is performed by the apparatus claims 1 as indicated above.

As to claim 13, Onaga and Mandel teach there inherently is have a method for designating a particular one of the plurality of printers for a particular print job (note: since there are a plurality of printers in the network, there inherently is have a method for designating a particular one of the plurality of printers for a particular print job).

As to claim 22, due to the similarity of this claim to that of claim 1, this claim is rejected as the reason applied to claim 1.

As to claim 27, Onaga teaches a print server (i.e., 120 in fig. 1) to which at least one printer (i.e., 110a in fig. 1) and a plurality of computers (150a to 150a to 150d in fig. 1) are connected to the print server comprising:

a job observation module (i.e., a software within the server) for monitoring the status of at least one printer connected to the print server,

a sender for sending the status to the plurality of computers simultaneously when the status of the at least one printer changes (note: the file server which maintains 3 types of files 'col. 4, lines 41-42' included in a single file having information regarding all the output devices 110 in LAN 'col. 4, lines 55-58', and which provides to all of workstations 150 'col. 6, lines 26-32'); (it is noted that col. 4, lines 60-65 describes that the status information from the peripheral devices is stored in a central location from which all workstations obtain it. Another important factor is that discovery need be performed only once for all intelligent peripheral devices and all workstations; and col. 6, lines 31-33 also describes that after the file server provides the devices status information to the workstations, **each** workstation 150 can read the device status file and display the device status information "col. 6, lines 29-30 and 32-33". And the device status files are preferably updated with sufficient frequency to provide the workstations. That means the file server provides all of the status of the peripheral devices **simultaneously** to the workstations. Even if a plurality of workstations requests to the file server the status of the peripheral devices at the same time, then the file server provides the status of the peripheral devices **simultaneously** to the plurality of requested workstations;

Although Onaga teaches that the device list files, device status file, and jobs files, is provided automatically to each workstation during the setup process "col. 5, lines 48-50", Onaga does not explicitly teach each of computers receives the status of the printers without sending a status request.

Mandel, in the same field of endeavor , teaches the print server in the network (please the fig. 22) can also automatically generate a network message to the users (or computers) a status of printers and jobs without receiving the request from the computers (col. 1, lines 40-46).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the server of Onaga for automatically notifying the status of a printer to the computers without receiving the request from the computers as taught by Mandel. The suggestion for modifying the system of Onaga can be reasoned by one of ordinary skill in the art as set forth by Mandel because the modified printer server would increase the advantage of the printing system by keeping track the status of the printer and automatically distributing the status of the printers to each of the computers. Such a modification would allow the users easily to find the status of the jobs and the printers.

As to claim 28, Onaga teaches that there is a plurality of printers (110s in fig. 1) connected to the print server (130 in fig. 1).

As to claim 29, the combination of Onaga and Mandel teaches the method is performed by the apparatus claim 27 as indicated above.

As to claim 30, Onaga teaches that there is a plurality of printers (110s in fig. 1) connected to the print server (130 in fig. 1).

As to claims 31-34, due to the similarities of these claims to those of claims 27 and 29, these claims are rejected as the reasons applied to claims 27-30.

As to claim 35, Onaga teaches:

a plurality of printers (i.e., 110a to 110e in fig. 1) and a plurality of computers (150a to 150a to 150d in fig. 1) connected to the print server (i.e., 120 in fig. 1);

the print server includes a job observation module (i.e., a software within the server) for monitoring an gathering the status of the plurality of printers connected to the print server, and sends the gathered status to the plurality of computers at the same time (note: the file server

which maintains 3 types of files 'col. 4, lines 41-42' included in a single file having information regarding all the output devices 110 in LAN 'col. 4, lines 55-58', and which provides to all of workstations 150 'col. 4, lines 62-65 and col. 6, lines 26-32' with updated and sufficient frequency "col. 5, lines 2-3").

Although Onaga teaches that the device list files, device status file, and jobs files, is provided automatically to each workstation during the setup process (col. 5, lines 48-50), Onaga does not explicitly teach each of computers receives the status of the printers without sending a status request.

Mandel, in the same field of endeavor , teaches the print server in the network (please the fig. 22) can also automatically generate a network message to the users (or computers) a status of printers and jobs without receiving the request from the computers (col. 1, lines 40-46).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the server of Onaga for automatically notifying the status of a printer to the computers without receiving the request from the computers as taught by Mandel. The suggestion for modifying the system of Onaga can be reasoned by one of ordinary skill in the art as set forth by Mandel because the modified printer server would increase the advantage of the printing system by keeping track the status of the printer and automatically distributing the status of the printers to each of the computers. Such a modification would allow the users easily to find the status of the jobs and the printers.

As to claims 40 and 48, Mandel teaches when a new received print job or the print job is completed from any of the computers, the print server sends the gathered status (col. 1, lines 41-

45. It is noted that the status of print job should be sent by the server because the printer connected to the network and the server "please see fig. 22").

As to claims 41 and 49, the combination of Onaga, Mandel and Mandel teaches the method is performed by the apparatus claims 40 and 48 as indicated above.

As to claims 42 and 50, due to the similarities of these claims to those of claims 40 and 48, these claims are rejected as reasons applied to claims 40 and 48.

As to claims 43 and 51, due to the similarities of these claims to those of claims 40 and 48, these claims are rejected as reasons applied to claims 40 and 48.

As to claims 44 and 52, due to the similarities of these claims to those of claims 41 and 49, these claims are rejected as reasons applied to claims 41 and 49.

As to claims 45 and 53, due to the similarities of these claims to those of claims 40 and 48, these claims are rejected as reasons applied to claims 40 and 48.

As to claims 46 and 54, due to the similarities of these claims to those of claims 41 and 49, these claims are rejected as reasons applied to claims 41 and 49.

As to claims 47 and 55, due to the similarities of these claims to those of claims 40 and 48, these claims are rejected as reasons applied to claims 40 and 48.

4. Claims 4, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Onaga and Mandel, as applied to claim 1 and 11 above, in view of Webb et al. (US Patent No. 5,727,135).

As to claims 4 and 14, Onaga and Mandel teach every feature in claims 1 and 11 as indicated above except for postpone a particular print job by a user of one of computers.

Webb teaches means for a user of one of the plurality of computers to postpone a particular print job (col. 2, line 58).

It would have been obvious to modify the monitor of Onaga for postpone a particular print job by a user of one of computers as taught by Webb. The suggestion for modifying the system of Onaga and Mandel can be reasoned by one of ordinary skill in the art as set forth by Webb because Webb provides an optional object displayed in the window including the object for postpone a particular print job by a user . Such modification would allow the system of Onaga to control the time for print jobs to the available printer.

5. Claims 6 and 15-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Onaga and Mandel, as applied to claim 1 and 11 above, in view of Hisatake (US Patent No. 5,669,040).

As to claim 6, Onaga teaches the features in claim 1 above.

However, Onaga and Mandel do not teach a waiting time for the printer which is displayed in the status monitor.

Hisatake teaches the status monitor of each of the plurality of computers includes means for displaying an operating condition in which a waiting time for the printer that is displayed in the status monitor (U32 and U16 in fig. 14).

It would have been obvious to have modified the display means of Onaga for displaying a waiting time as taught by Hisatake. The suggestion of modifying the system of Onaga and Mandel can be reasoned by one of ordinary skill in the art as set forth by Hisatake because Hisatake provides more status options displayed in the window including the waiting time. Such

modification would allows the system of Onaga to control the time of the new print jobs to the available printer.

As to claims 15-16, the combination of Onaga, Mandel and Hisatake teaches the method is performed by the apparatus claim 6.

6. Claims 17-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Onaga and Mandel ,as applied to claim 11 above, in view of Suzuki et al. (US Patent No. 6,213,652).

As to claims 17-19, Onaga and Mandel teach the features in claim 11 above.

However, Onaga and Mandel do not teach exchanging registration request and response between the computers and the print server

Suzuki teaches the computers and the print server exchange registration request and response (col. 9, lines 29-60).

It would have been obvious to have modified the printing system of Onaga and Mandel for exchanging the registration signal between the hosts and the print server as taught by Suzuki. The suggestion of modifying the system of Onaga and Mandel can be reasoned by one of ordinary skill in the art as set forth by Suzuki because Suzuki provides the password option that allow the clients to check their print job status. This above feature would modify the system of Onaga in order to increase the security of their system.

7. Claims 10, 21 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Onaga and Mandel, as applied to claims 1,11 and 22, in view of Hamazaki (JPO Patent No. JP409212313A).

As to claim 10, Onaga and Mandel teach the feature in claim 1 above.

However, Onaga and Mandel do not teach the print server includes means for calculating a waiting time for availability of each of the plurality of printers.

Hamazaki teaches the print server includes means (i.e., a print time estimation part 109 calculates the estimated time of every print job) for calculating a waiting time for availability of the printer (See Solution).

It would have been obvious to have modified the print server of Onaga and Mandel for including calculator calculates the waiting time of print jobs in a server as taught by Hamazaki. The suggestion of modifying the system of Onaga and Mandel can be reasoned by one of ordinary skill in the art as set forth by Hamazaki because Hamazaki provides that a print time estimation part for calculates the estimated time of every waiting print job. Such modification would allows the system of Onaga to control the time of the new print jobs to the available printer.

As to claim 21, the combination of Onaga, Mandel and Hamazaki teaches the methods are performed by the apparatus claim 10 as indicated above.

As to claim 23, due to the similarity of this claim to that of claim 10, this claim is rejected as the reason applied to claim 10.

Response to Arguments and Amendment

8. Applicant's arguments filed 1/21/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. This action is made **non-final**.

The new reference of Mandel would cite for overcoming the new limitation of " each of

computers receives the status of a printer without requesting the status of the printer" .

Applicant asserted that " Onaga does not teach that the status information of a plurality of peripheral devices is simultaneously provided to a plurality of work stations ". In reply, Onaga clearly teaches that, with respect to col. 4, lines 60-65, the status information from the peripheral devices is stored in a central location from which all workstations obtain it. Another important factor is that discovery need be performed only once for all intelligent peripheral devices and all workstations; and col. 6, lines 31-33 also describes that after the file server provides the devices status information to the workstations, **each** workstation 150 can read the device status file and display the device status information "col. 6, lines 29-30 and 32-33". And col. 5, lines 2-3 teach that the device status files are preferably updated with sufficient frequency to provide the workstations. That means the file server provides all of the status of the peripheral devices **simultaneously** to the workstations. Even if a plurality of workstations request to the file server the status of the peripheral devices at the same time, then the file server provides the status of the peripheral devices **simultaneously** to the plurality of workstations).

Onaga also teaches that the file server which maintains 3 types of files 'col. 4, lines 41-42' included in a single file having information regarding all the output devices 110 in LAN 'col. 4, lines 55-58', and which provides to all of workstations 150 'col. 4, lines 62-65 and col. 6, lines 26-32' with updated and sufficient frequency "col. 5, lines 2-3". Therefore, the updated status information is provided to all workstation in sufficient frequency. That means at the same time the updated status information is provided to all workstation.

Furthermore, Mandel teaches the well known in the prior art that in the network system, the system **automatically** generate a network message back to **the terminals** the status of the job

or the printer (col. 1, lines 40-46). Onaga also teaches the network terminals and the network printers. Therefore, based on the combination of the teaching in Onaga and Mandel, the network terminals of Onaga could automatically receives the changing of the status of the network printers via any device in the network.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the cited prior art fully discloses the claimed invention and the rejection stand.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Douglas Q. Tran whose telephone number is (703) 305-4857 or E-mail address is Douglas.tran@uspto.gov.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-4700.

Douglas Q. Tran
Mar. 25, 2004